



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/606,547 | 06/26/2003 | James R. Wason | END920020072 | 5225 |
| 7590 | 03/21/2008 | | EXAMINER | |
| Andrew M. Calderon Greenblum and Bernstein P.L.C. 1950 Roland Clarke Place Reston, VA 20191 | | | NGUYEN, MAIKHANH | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2176 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/21/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/606,547

Filing Date: June 26, 2003

Appellant(s): WASON, JAMES R.

Andrew M. Calderon
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed December 14, 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed September 15, 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or having a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appeal claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relyed Upon

The following is listing of the evidence relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal:

| | | | |
|---|----------|-------------------------|---------------|
| - | Prinzing | U.S. Pat. No. 6,480,206 | November 2002 |
| - | Prinzing | U.S. Pat. No. 6,470,364 | October 2002 |

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-15, 19, 20, 24-31, 33-35, 43-45, and 47-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Prinzing** (US Pat. 6480206, Date of Patent: 11/12/2002, hereinafter Prinzing'206) in view of **Prinzing** (US Pat. 6470364, Date of Patent: 10/22/2002, hereinafter Prinzing'364).

As to claim 1:

Prinzing'206 teaches a method of representing and managing rich text for use by applications (*see the Abstract*), the method comprising the steps of:

- providing one or more classes (*e.g., provides a variety of... classes*) for use by the applications (*e.g., accessible to GUI application*) to at least create and manage (*e.g., formatting and displaying*) one or more rich text nodes (*e.g., a hierarchy of text elements*) in a memory structure representation representative of rich text (*e.g., storing formatting information and attributes of the text elements and view objects 121 for formatting and displaying text on display device 105*)
[Prinzing'206: the discussion at col.3, line 43-col.4, line 57];

- representing the rich text in the memory structure representation (*e.g., text 117 may be organized as a hierarchy of text elements including a document element, paragraphs elements, and character elements; col.3, lines 43-53*); and

- editing the rich text in a document using the memory structure representation to perform editing functions on the document having the rich text as managed and created by the one or more classes (*e.g., allows styles to be added and removed modularly by organizing the text within the document and objects that format the text hierarchically...new styles are added by adding the formatting information to a style object and associating a new view object capable of generating a view of the new style with the corresponding text element in the hierarchy; col.2, lines 44-61*).

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach the use of Web based applications and browsers.

Prinzing'364 suggests the use of Web based applications and browsers (*e.g., see the HTML document and Internet discussion at col.1, line 55- col.2, line 10; col.4, line 63- col.5, line 12; and col.9, line 61-col.10, line 1; and col.11, lines 36-67*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 2:

Prinzing'206 teaches providing a rich text list class (*e.g., provides a variety of ... classes*) for managing (*e.g., formatting and displaying*) the one or more rich text nodes (*e.g., a hierarchy of text elements*) in the memory structure representation (*e.g., level in hierarchy*); providing a rich text class (*e.g., provides a variety of ... classes*) to create the one or more rich text nodes each representing a unit of rich text and its attributes (*e.g.; provide formatting attributes such as bold, underline, and italic for text*) and instantiating the rich text list class and the rich text class [*col.3, lines 6-53 & col.4, lines 58-66*].

As to claim 3:

Prinzing'206 teaches the representing rich text step includes representing string representations (*e.g., character elements; col.3, line 50 & sequence of characters; col.4, line 65*).

As to claim 4:

Prinzing'206 teaches the string representations comprise, among other things, plain text (*e.g., text 117; col.3, lines 43*).

As to claim 5:

Prinzing'206 teaches providing rich text attributes (*e.g., attributes*), wherein the attributes include, among other things, italicized (*e.g., italic object*) [col.4, lines 58-67].

As to claim 6:

Prinzing'206 teaches providing properties associated with the one or more rich text nodes, the properties comprising, among other things, text (*e.g., text 117; col.3, line 43*).

As to claim 7:

Prinzing'206 teaches the rich text node comprises a table node for defining a table (*e.g., a linear table of attributes; col.4, lines 8-10*).

As to claim 8:

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach “*the table node includes at least one of a table header node and a table body node, for defining the characteristics and format of the table.*”

Prinzing'364 teaches the table node includes at least one of a table header node and a table body node, for defining the characteristics and format of the table (*see item 416 in fig.4*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 9:

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach “*one or more heading cell nodes, each heading cell node defining another rich text node.*”

Prinzing'364 teaches one or more heading cell nodes, each heading cell node defining another rich text node (*col.7, lines 22-34*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 10:

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach “*one or more table row nodes for defining an individual row within the table.*”

Prinzing'364 teaches one or more table row nodes for defining an individual row within the table (*col.7, lines 22-34*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 11:

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach “*one or more row cell nodes for defining rich text in a cell in the individual row, each of the one or more row cell nodes defining another rich text node.*”

Prinzing'364 teaches one or more row cell nodes for defining rich text in a cell in the individual row, each of the one or more row cell nodes defining another rich text node (*col.7, lines 22-34*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text

and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 12:

Prinzing'206 teaches providing well-formed segments of text to a current rich text node of the one or more rich text nodes from a rich text list node (e.g., *divide text in document into a hierarchical arrangement of text elements; see item 502 in fig.5*); parsing the well-formed segments of text (*col.2, lines 31-54*); setting attributes in the current rich text node, the attributes including, among other things, bold (e.g., *formatting attributes such as bold; col.4, lines 58-67*).

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach “*assigning unparsed segments of text to the current rich text node's text attribute; and resolving the current rich text node's text attribute by extracting tag information.*”

Prinzing'364 teaches assigning unparsed segments of text to the current rich text node's text attribute; and resolving the current rich text node's text attribute by extracting tag information (*col.10, lines 6-34 & table 3*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a

particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 13:

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach "*suppressing certain tags associated with some the unparsed segments by changing starting and ending tags to substitution strings; checking whether the starting and ending tags are in proper order and eliminating pairs of the starting and the ending tags that have null content; converting some of the substitution strings to original values; and reconstituting the well-formed segments of text into one string when pairs of starting and end tags are eliminated.*"

Prinzing'364 teaches suppressing certain tags associated with some the unparsed segments by changing starting and ending tags to substitution strings; checking whether the starting and ending tags are in proper order and eliminating pairs of the starting and the ending tags that have null content; converting some of the substitution strings to original values; and reconstituting the well-formed segments of text into one string when pairs of starting and end tags are eliminated (*col.7, lines 10-62 & table 8*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a

particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 14:

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach "*restoring table related tags; and breaking the well-formed segments at table tags and organizing the broken segments into a new rich text list node with entries of at least one of vectors and string.*"

Prinzing'364 teaches *restoring table related tags; and breaking the well-formed segments at table tags and organizing the broken segments into a new rich text list node with entries of at least one of vectors and string (col.7, lines 10-62 & table 8).*

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 15:

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach "*the text is at least one of hypertext mark-up language and extensible mark-up language.*"

Prinzing'364 teaches the text is, among other things, hypertext mark-up language (*e.g., HTML; col. 6, line 50*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 19:

Prinzing'206 teaches responding to a request for editing a document containing the rich text; presenting rich text editing controls for editing the document; and accepting changes to the document (*e.g., styles to be added or removed modularly by organizing the text; col.2, lines 44-47*) using one or more classes including a rich text class and a rich text list class for editing the document (*col.3, lines 6-53 & col.4, lines 58-66*).

As to claim 20:

Prinzing'206 teaches the accepting changes step includes accepting changes, among other things, text (*e.g., styles to be added or removed modularly by organizing the text; col.2, lines 44-47*).

As to claim 43:

Prinzing'206 teaches an apparatus for providing a means for representing and managing rich text for used by applications (*see the Abstract*), the apparatus comprising:

- a component representing rich text in a memory structure representation (*e.g., text 117 may be organized as a hierarchy of text elements including a document element, paragraphs elements, and character elements; col.3, lines 43-53;*)

- a component providing one or more classes (*e.g., provides a variety of ... classes*) for use by the application (*e.g., accessible to GUI application*) to create the memory structure representation (*e.g., storing formatting information and attributes of the text elements and view objects 121 for formatting and displaying text on display device 105*) [see the discussion beginning at col.3, line 43]; wherein the one or more classes includes, a rich text list class (*e.g., organizes the text in the document into a hierarchical arrangement of text elements*) for managing one or more rich text nodes (*e.g., formatting a text element*) and a rich text class to create one or more rich text (*e.g., Each style object may include the formatting information for different levels of the text element hierarchy. Accordingly, a document style object is associated with the document element, paragraph style objects are associated with the paragraph elements, and character style objects are associated with the character elements. Next, the method associates style objects with the text elements*) each representing a unit (*e.g., a document element,*

a paragraph element, and character elements) of a rich text and its attributes (e.g., attributes) [col.5, lines 43-62].

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach the use of Web based applications and browsers.

Prinzing'364 suggests the use of Web based applications and browsers (e.g., see the **HTML document and Internet discussion at col.1, line 55- col.2, line 10; col.4, line 63- col.5, line 12; and col.9, line 61-col.10, line 1; and col.11, lines 36-67**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 44:

Prinzing'206 teaches a component instantiating the rich text list class and the rich text class; and a component editing rich text in a document using the rich text class (*col.3, lines 6-53 & col.4, lines 58-66*).

As to claim 45:

Prinzing'206 teaches the component for representing rich text includes representing a string (e.g., *character elements; col.3, line 50 & sequence of characters; col.4, line 65*), the string including, among other things, plain text (e.g., *text 117; col.3, lines 43*).

As to claim 47:

Prinzing'206 teaches a component (e.g. *memory 102*) representing rich text in a memory structure representation (e.g., *text 117 may be organized as a hierarchy of text elements including a document element, paragraphs elements, and character elements; col.3, lines 43-53*) and the component (e.g., *a develop kit 'DK'126*) providing one or more classes (e.g., *provides a variety of ... classes*) for use by the application (e.g., *accessible to GUI application*) and is contained, among other things, a library (e.g., *variety of libraries*) [col.3, lines 43-53]. Refer to claim 43 for rejection of “Web based applications and browsers”.

As to claims 48-50:

Refer to claims 1-3 above. Claims 48-50 are the same as claims 1-3, except claims 48-50 are computer program product claims and claims 1-3 are method claims.

As to claim 24:

It is directed to a method for presenting the apparatus of claim 43, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, Prinzing'206 teaches providing well-formed

segments of text to the one or more current rich text nodes (*e.g., divide text in document into a hierarchical arrangement of text elements; see item 502 in fig.5*) from a rich text list node to initialize the current rich text nodes for representing rich text in a document (*e.g., provides style objects having information used to describe attributes and information for formatting a text element (step 504). Each style object may include the formatting information for different levels of the text element hierarchy; col.5, lines 50-55*).

As to claim 25:

Prinzing'206 teaches instantiating the rich text list class and the rich text class (*col.3, lines 6-53 & col.4, lines 58-66*); and editing the rich text in the document using the rich text nodes created by the rich text class (*col.3, lines 6-31*).

As to claim 26:

Prinzing'206 teaches the representing rich text step includes representing string representations (*e.g., character elements; col.3, line 50 & sequence of characters; col.4, line 65 & fig.2*), the string representations including, among other things, plain text (*e.g., text 117; col.3, lines 43*).

As to claim 27:

Prinzing'206 teaches the rich text includes attributes (*e.g., attributes*), among other things, underlined (*e.g., underline*)*[col.4, lines 58-67]*.

As to claim 28:

Prinzing'206 teaches the one or more rich text node includes properties (*e.g. attributes*), the properties comprising, among other things, text (*e.g., text elements*)*[col.4, lines 1-4]*.

As to claim 29:

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach “*a table node for defining a table and the table node includes at least one of a table header node and a table body node, for defining the characteristics and format of the table.*”

Prinzing'364 teaches a table node for defining a table and the table node includes at least one of a table header node and a table body node, for defining the characteristics and format of the table (*col.7, lines 10-34*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

.

As to claim 30:

Prinzing'206 does not specifically teach "*one or more heading cell nodes, each heading cell node defining another rich text node, and wherein the table body node comprises one or more table row nodes for defining an individual row within the table.*"

Prinzing'364 teaches one or more heading cell nodes, each heading cell node defining another rich text node, and wherein the table body node comprises one or more table row nodes for defining an individual row within the table (*col.7, lines 10-34*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claim 31:

Prinzing'206 does not teach "*one or more row cell nodes for defining rich text in a cell in the individual row, each of the one or more row cell nodes defining another rich text node.*"

Prinzing'364 teaches one or more row cell nodes for defining rich text in a cell in the individual row, each of the one or more row cell nodes defining another rich text node (*col.7, lines 10-34*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prinzing'206 with Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for customizing text components that edit a particular type of text and have a particular type of user interface style as well as viewing and interacting with various type of Internet resources available on the World Wide Web.

As to claims 33, 34, and 35:

Refer to the discussion of claims 13, 14, and 12 above, respectively, for rejections.

Claims 21-23, 32, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Prinzing'206** in view of **Prinzing'364** as applied to claims 1, 19, 24, and 43 above, and further in view of **Domini et al.** (U.S. Pat. No. 6085206, issued 07/04/2000).

As to claim 21:

The combination of Prinzing'206 and Prinzing'364 does not specifically teach “*responding to a spell checking request; presenting a spell check panel that displays*

spelling alternatives to a misspelled word associated with the one or more rich text nodes; and accepting a spelling substitution.”

Domini teaches responding to a spell checking request; presenting a spell check panel that displays spelling alternatives to a misspelled word associated with the one or more rich text nodes; and accepting a spelling substitution (*col.10, line 1-col.11, line 67 & col.13, line 10-col.14, line 5*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Domini with Prinzing'206 as modified by as modified by Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for verifying the accuracy of the grammatical composition of a sentence and the spelling of words within the sentence in an electronic document (*see Domini; Abstract*).

As to claim 22:

The combination of Prinzing'206 and Prinzing'364 does not specifically teach “*the responding to a spell checking request step includes searching a spelling dictionary to locate one or more words for presentation in the spell check panel.*”

Domini teaches the responding to a spell checking request step includes searching a spelling dictionary to locate one or more words for presentation in the spell check panel (*col.20, lines 9-34*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Domini in the system of Prinzing'206 as modified by Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for verifying the accuracy of the grammatical composition of a sentence and the spelling of words within the sentence in an electronic document (*see Domini; Abstract*).

As to claim 23:

The combination of Prinzing'206 and Prinzing'364 does not specifically teach “*the one or more words in the dictionary each have one or more associated signatures to aid in locating a match for the misspelled word.*”

Domini teaches the one or more words in the dictionary each have one or more associated signatures to aid in locating a match for the misspelled word (*col.17, lines 37-67*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Domini in the system of Prinzing'206 as modified by Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for verifying the accuracy of the grammatical composition of a sentence and the spelling of words within the sentence in an electronic document (*see Domini; Abstract*).

As to claim 32:

The combination of Prinzing'206 and Prinzing'364 does not specifically teach "*providing a spell checker class for use by the applications for locating replacement words in the document having rich text.*"

Domini teaches providing a spell checker class for use by the applications for locating replacement words in the document having rich text (*col.9, lines 6-67 & col.11, line 61-col.12, line 58*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Domini in the system of Prinzing'206 as modified by Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for verifying the accuracy of the grammatical composition of a sentence and the spelling of words within the sentence in an electronic document (*see Domini; Abstract*).

As to claim 46:

The combination of Prinzing'206 and Prinzing'364 does not teach "*a component for providing spell checking using the memory structure representation.*"

Domini teaches a component for providing spell checking using the memory structure representation (*col.11, lines 9-67*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Domini in the system of Prinzing'206 as modified by Prinzing'364 because it would have provided the capability for verifying the accuracy of the grammatical composition of a sentence and the spelling of words within the sentence in an electronic document (*see Domini; Abstract*).

(10) Response to Arguments

Beginning on page 7 of the brief, Appellants argue the following issues, which are accordingly addressed below.

a. **Regarding claims 1-15, 19, 20, 24-31, 33-35, 43-45, and 47-50:**

Appellant argues in substance that Prinzing'364 does not teach providing one or more classes for use by Web based applications to at least create and manage one or more rich text nodes in a memory structure representation of rich text; and the combination of references does not teach or suggest a Web based application or browser, in combination with the remaining features of the respective independent claim [pages 7-26].

In response, The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Appellant. The rejection as clarified above shows how the combination of Prinzing'206 and Prinzing'364 meets the limitations as claimed by Applicant. Prinzing'206 teaches providing one or more classes (*e.g., provides a variety of... classes*) for use by the applications (*e.g., accessible to GUI application*) to at least create and manage (*e.g., formatting and displaying*) one or more rich text nodes (*e.g., a hierarchy of text elements*) in a memory structure representation representative of rich text (*e.g., storing formatting information and attributes of the text elements and view objects 121 for formatting and displaying text on display device 105*) [Prinzing'206: the discussion at col.3, line 43-col.4, line 57].

Prinzing'364 is combined with Prinzing'206 to suggest a Web based application (*e.g., see the HTML document and Internet discussion at col.1, line 55- col.2, line 10; col.4, line 63-col.5, line 12; and col.9, line 61-col.10, line 1; and col.11, lines 36-67*). Prinzing'364 must use a browser to locate and display the HTML document.

b. **Regarding claims 21-23:**

- Firstly, Appellant simply points out what is recited in claim 21 and asserts that "*Appellant submits that no proper combination of the Prinzing'206, Prinzing'364 and Domini teaches these features*" [page 26].

- In response, this quote is the extent of explanation provided by Appellant in support of claims 21-23. This response by Appellant is insufficient to satisfy the requirement of specific argument to have the claims considered for patentability; in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Appellant must distinctly and specifically point out “how the language of the claims patently distinguishes them from the references”.
- Secondly, Appellant argues in substance that Domini does not teach or suggest *providing one or more classes for use by the application to at least create and manage one or more rich text nodes in a memory structure representation representative of rich text, where the application is a Web based application or browser* [page 26].
- In response, the combinations of Prinzing'206 and Prinzing'364 is used to teach *“providing one or more classes for use by the application to at least create and manage one or more rich text nodes in a memory structure representation representative of rich text, where the application is a Web based application or browser”*, not Domini.

c. **Regarding claim 32:**

- Firstly, Appellant simply points out what is recited in claim 32 and asserts that *“Appellant submits that no proper combination of the Prinzing '206, Prinzing '364 and Domini teaches these features”* [page 27].

- In response, this quote is the extent of explanation provided by Appellant in support of claims 21-23. This response by Appellant is insufficient to satisfy the requirement of specific argument to have the claims considered for patentability; in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Appellant must distinctly and specifically point out “how the language of the claims patently distinguishes them from the references”.
- Secondly, Appellant argues in substance that Domini does not teach or suggest *providing one or more classes for use by the application to at least create and manage one or more rich text nodes in a memory structure representation representative of rich text, where the applications are Web based applications or browsers* [page 27].
- In response, the combinations of Prinzing'206 and Prinzing'364 is used to teach *“providing one or more classes for use by the applications to create the memory structure representation, where the applications are Web based applications or browsers”*, not Domini.

d. **Regarding claim 46:**

- Firstly, Appellant simply points out what is recited in claim 46 and asserts that *“Appellant submits that no proper combination of the Prinzing'206, Prinzing'364 and Domini teaches these features”* [page 28].
- In response, this quote is the extent of explanation provided by Appellant in support of claims 21-23. This response by Appellant is insufficient to

satisfy the requirement of specific argument to have the claims considered for patentability; in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Appellant must distinctly and specifically point out “how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references”.

- Secondly, Appellant argues in substance that Domini does not teach or suggest does not teach or suggest a component providing one or more classes for use by Web based applications or browsers to create the memory structure representation [page 28].
- In response, the combinations of Prinzing'206 and Prinzing'364 is used to teach *“providing one or more classes for use by the applications to create the memory structure representation, where the applications are Web based applications or browsers”*, not Domini.

11. Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Maikhahanh Nguyen/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176

Conferees:

Doug Hutton (SPE, Art Unit 2176)

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100

Stephen Hong (SPE, Art Unit 2178)

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

William Bashore (Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176)

/William L. Bashore/
William L. Bashore
Primary Examiner
Tech Center 2100

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.

1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191